



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,055	11/25/2003	John M. Deegan	POU920030144US1	7775
46429 7:	590 08/09/2006		EXAM	INER
	LBURN LLP-IBM	BAKER, STEPHEN M		
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2133	
			DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/723,055	DEEGAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stephen M. Baker	2133			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Jules</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 8 and 10-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3,5-7 and 9 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	· election requirement.	·			
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the confidence of the c	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 112503.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

- 1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "drivers" recited by claims 2 and 10 and the various "means" recited in claim 17 must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.
- 2. The drawings are objected to because: Regarding Fig. 1, the bracket below "ARRAY OF x4" apparently designates the width of a "symbol slice" and should be labeled as such. It's not understood why two clock lines are shown for each symbol slice and one of the clock lines only connects to two of the four chips in each symbol slice.
- 3. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an

Application/Control Number: 10/723,055 Page 3

Art Unit: 2133

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In paragraph 0007, applicant describes a "memory subsystem comprising: a means for configuring a memory device array into symbol slices"..., a means for establishing a plurality of command buses" etc. however what is apparently shown is apparently a "memory subsystem design method comprising: a step of configuring a memory device array into symbol slices ..., a step of establishing a plurality of command buses" etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly

claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 2, 4, 8 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,055

Art Unit: 2133

Regarding claim 2, "further including said command register exhibiting sufficient command bus drivers to support each command bus" is unclear and apparently not idiomatic English; it is not understood why it is said the command register is "exhibiting" drivers.

Regarding claims 4 and 12, describing an error correction code as an "existing error correction code scheme" does not appear to add any definite further limit to the error correction code.

Regarding claim 8, "said error correction code" apparently should be "said other error correction code".

Regarding claim 10, "The method of command bus redundancy" apparently should be "A method for providing command bus redundancy" or the like.

Regarding claim 11, "communicating a memory controller" is unclear; "said error correction code" apparently should be "another error correction code".

Regarding claim 13, "communicating a memory interface device" is unclear.

Regarding claim 15, "communicating a command register" and "communicating a memory controller" are unclear.

Regarding claim 16, "communicating a memory interface device" is unclear.

Regarding claim 17, a set of steps of a memory subsystem design method is apparently being mis-described as a set of means of a memory subsystem.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,055 Page 5

Art Unit: 2133

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,981,095 to MacLaren *et al* (hereafter "MacLaren").

MacLaren discloses a "memory subsystem" wherein data is interleaved across a plurality of segments 24, with each segment having its own quadword ECC code and with one or more parity segments providing a form of RAID-type ECC (column 5, lines 9-20) over the plurality of segments. Accordingly, each segment is a "symbol slice" of a RAID-type "error correction code packet." Each segment includes one or more DIMMs. A plurality of command buses (MNET buses) 22 are provided, one for each segment. A single host/data controller 16, 18 coupled to the memory controllers 20 for each segment drives each command bus, providing "command repowering" (column 18, lines 61-63, etc.). The host/data controller 16, 18 apparently requires an address register serving as a "command register" coupled to the command buses 22, however MacLaren does not mention an address register in the host/data controller 16, 18. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to realize MacLaren's host/data controller 16, 18 with logic including an address register. Such a realization would have been obvious because an address register is presumably required to interface between the command buses 22 of the memory subsystem and the addresses produced by

Application/Control Number: 10/723,055

Art Unit: 2133

those devices, such as CPUs 12, sending read and write requests to the memory

subsystem.

Allowable Subject Matter

Page 6

9. Claims 2, 4, 8, 11 and 13-16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the

rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to

include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Baker whose telephone number is (571)

272-3814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (11:00 AM - 7:30

PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

-1

Application/Control Number: 10/723,055

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

-3-

Page 7

Stephen M. Baker Primary Examiner Art Unit 2133

smb